1	THE WITNESS: Would you repeat the question?
2	MS. HIGHTMAN:
3	Q. Yes. Would you agree that the
4	Commission should insure that any compensation
5	mechanism it approves in this proceeding compensates
6	Focal for the costs it incurs in transporting and
7	delivering traffic to the internet?
8	A. I would agree that the Commission should
9	insure that in this context that Ameritech should
10	or, I'm sorry, Focal should be compensated for the
11	costs that Ameritech puts on their network.
12	Q. I don't think you have answered my
13	question so let me try it again.
14	A. Okay.
15	Q. Isn't the issue, Issue 2 here, which is
16	the issue you are addressing, relates to the
17	intercarrier compensation mechanism for the transport
18	and delivery of internet-bound calls, right?
19	A. I think that's fair, yes.
20	Q. And isn't it correct to state that it's
21	your position in this case that Ameritech should pay
22	something and you propose an amount?

1 Α. Yes. 2 For that, for Focal performing those 3 functions for calls originating on Ameritech's 4 network and delivered to an internet service provider 5 that's a Focal customer? 6 A. I propose that. 7 And isn't it correct to state that it 0. 8 would be appropriate that the Commission should 9 ensure that, when it sets that rate, the rate should 10 compensate Focal for the costs that Focal incurs for 11 delivering, transporting and delivering to Focal's internet service provider customer calls that 12 13 originate on Ameritech's network? 14 MR. HARVEY: I would have to object. 15 seemed to me to be pretty compound. I think that the 16 substance of it is not objectionable in any way but 17 that could be about three questions. 18 MS. HIGHTMAN: I really think it was one 19 question. 20 EXAMINER WOODS: Do you understand the 21 question, Mr. Phipps?

THE WITNESS: If she could repeat it, I

would like that. 1 2 EXAMINER WOODS: Try it again. 3 MS. HIGHTMAN: 4 Wouldn't you agree that the compensation 5 level the Commission sets in this case should 6 compensate Focal for the costs Focal incurs 7 transporting and delivering traffic to internet 8 service providers on its network that were originated 9 on Ameritech's network by Ameritech's local 10 customers? 11 Well, I would agree that Focal should be 12 compensated for the costs that originate on 13 Ameritech's network and incurred by Focal in routing 14 that traffic to ISP customers. 15 So your answer is yes? I am not sure if Q. 16 you are differing with me and I need to understand 17 that so I can see if I should ask you any further 18 questions. Well, I think you say transport and 19 Α. 20 termination, and I think my rate is indicative of the 21 costs that Focal incurs. 22 I didn't ask you anything about the rate 0.

1 that you are proposing. I am asking you about the 2 rate the Commission should set. And let me ask you 3 again; it's a very simple question. Would you agree 4 that the Commission should set a rate that 5 compensates Focal for any costs that it incurs 6 transporting and delivering to its internet service 7 provider customers calls that originate on Ameritech's network? 8 9 Α. I would agree with that. 10 And you would also agree with me, Q. 11 wouldn't you, that any compensation mechanism that 12 fails to do so would require Focal to bear these 13 costs, by definition? 14 MR. FRIEDMAN: I will object to the question 15 as argumentative for the exact reason that counsel 16 has stated. 17 MS. HIGHTMAN: It's not argumentative. 18 a conclusion drawn from the prior answer. Frankly, and I guess it's 19 EXAMINER WOODS: 2.0 my chance to not want to quibble here, I think Focal 21 always bears the costs that it bears. I think the

real question is whether or not they recover the

1	costs. Whatever costs they bear, they bear. If the
2	rate is not set, the question is would they then not
3	recover those costs.
4	MS. HIGHTMAN: Can you answer that question?
5	THE WITNESS: Well, I would say if
6	Ameritech if Focal incurs costs originating on
7	Ameritech's network that are not compensated, then I
8	would say, yes, that Focal would bear those costs.
9	If they choose to bear those costs. I mean, if they
10	don't recover those costs in another way.
11	MS. HIGHTMAN:
12	Q. In what other way are you referring to?
13	A. Whatever way they choose.
14	Q. Well, sitting here today what other way
15	do you know of that would enable them to recover the
16	costs?
17	A. I'm not aware of any personally.
18	Q. In fact, currently they can not recover
19	those costs from the ISPs, can they?
20	A. Not in access charges.
21	Q. And they can't recover those costs from
22	ISPs through intrastate charges either, can they?

1	A. Well, it depends on what costs you are
2	talking about.
3	Q. We have been talking about the same
4	costs in this whole series of questions.
5	A. If you are talking about reciprocal
6	compensation costs, no.
7	Q. So they can't recover them from the
8	ISPs. So where else would they recover them?
9	A. I guess they would be borne by Focal.
10	Q. Thank you. At page 10 of your verified
11	statement you state that the FCC has distinguished
12	between ISP traffic and local traffic at line 188?
13	A. Yes.
14	Q. The FCC has not reached any conclusion
15	regarding any functional difference between calls
16	delivered to the internet and local traffic, right?
17	A. When you say functional, I don't think I
18	know exactly what you are talking about.
19	Q. Would you agree with me that
20	functionally, the way a call is routed, whether it's
21	a call to an internet service provider, a local call,
22	well, it's delivered to an internet service provider

1	versus, for example, a call delivered to a corporate
2	LAN, a local call made to a corporate LAN, there is
3	functionally no difference between those two calls,
4	right?
5	A. Well, I believe they do make that
6	distinction that a call to an ISP is routed to a
7	foreign web site as opposed to a local call which is
8	actually terminated at the switch.
9	Q. With respect to delivering the call to
10	the internet service provider, they don't the FCC
11	does not make any distinction functionally between
12	the call to the internet service provider versus a
13	regular local call, isn't that right?
14	A. Well, I believe I just answered the
15	question in that they have made a distinction between
16	those two.
17	Q. I am asking you a different question.
18	A. Okay.
19	Q. You described what happens after the
20	call is delivered to the ISP and where it goes from
21	there, right?
22	A. Yes.

1	Q. And that's the distinction the FCC drew
2	when it reached its interstate jurisdictional
3	determination, right?
4	A. Uh-huh.
5	Q. My question for you is different. My
6	question is the FCC did not identify any functional
7	difference between a local call and a call delivered
8	to the internet service provider before it's passed
9	onto the internet, right?
10	A. If you qualify that with "before it's
11	passed onto the internet," I'm not aware of any
12	distinction.
13	Q. You have prepared no cost study to
14	determine the actual costs associated with transport
15	and delivery of internet-bound calls, isn't that
16	right?
17	A. No.
18	Q. That's not right?
19	A. Oh, I'm sorry, no, I have not prepared a
20	cost study.
21	Q. And you have merely adjusted one output
22	of Ameritech's cost study that measures costs

associated with all local traffic in coming up with 1 your proposal, isn't that right? 2 3 Α. Yes. Your adjusted end office rate that you 4 are proposing in this case reflects only one 5 difference between calls delivered to the internet 6 and non-internet local calls, isn't that right? 7 Yes, I believe that's right. 8 A. The length of the call? 9 0. The duration of the call. 10 Α. Your adjusted rate which you are 11 Q. proposing in this case reflects no other differences 12 between those two types of calls, the two types being 13 14 local calls and calls delivered to the internet, 15 right? 16 Α. I don't believe so, no. It is not your position, however, is it, 17 0. that there are no other differences between calls 18 delivered to the internet and local calls that might 19 impact the cost of transporting and delivering those 20 21 calls?

22

Α.

Well, I think as I state in my verified

1 statement, that if the actual cost models were 2 examined that initially were used to determine those 3 rates, that some marginal improvements might be 4 possible. 5 Well, I wanted to ask you about your 6 marginal differences. You have not attempted to 7 quantify what the impact of any of those differences is, right? 8 9 Α. No, I haven't. 10 So, since you haven't quantified them, Q. 11 you don't know sitting here today whether the 12 differences would be marginal or more than marginal, 13 right? 14 Well, based on the possible differences 15 that were identified by Mr. Starkey in his testimony, 16 I think they would be marginal, but, no, I haven't 17 quantified that. 18 And you have not attempted to identify 19 an exhaustive list of all the differences that would 20 be relevant were you to do a cost study of the cost 21 of traffic delivered to the internet, right?

22

Α.

No.

1	Q. So you couldn't know sitting here today,
2	could you, what the difference would be
3	quantitatively from what you are working with here in
4	this case?
5	A. I couldn't know that.
6	Q. Would you agree that to the extent that
7	actually, let me back up a second and give you a
8	foundational question. We are using in this case
9	Ameritech's cost studies to come up with the
10	compensation mechanism for NXX, right?
11	A. Yes.
12	Q. To the extent that Ameritech's cost
13	studies assume a less expensive switch and trunk
14	compensation than Focal actually uses, you would
15	agree, wouldn't you, that the reciprocal compensation
16	rate used by Focal would under recover its costs?
17	A. I think there is other factors that
18	would need to be examined to determine. But based on
19	those two factors alone, I think that could be a fair
20	characterization.
21	Q. And you have not attempted to determine
22	the cost or the types of switch and trunk

1	concentration that Focal uses for purposes of
2	determining the appropriate level of the intercarrier
3	compensation, right?
4	A. I'm sorry, could you repeat that
5	question?
6	Q. You have not attempted to identify and
7	cost out the switch and trunk concentration that is
8	actually used by Focal for purposes of coming up with
9	your proposal?
L 0	A. Well, I don't believe that there is any
L1	costs available to do that.
L2	Q. But you haven't looked at any costs?
L 3	A. No, I haven't.
L 4	Q. Are you familiar with the Ameritech cost
L 5	model that was used to develop the cost information
L 6	you present?
L 7	A. Generally.
L 8	Q. Would you agree that Ameritech's cost
L 9	model provides cost information relevant to traffic
20	in an average day?
21	A. Well, when you are talking about the
2	cost model, are you talking about the SCIS or the

1	NCAT?
2	Q. NCAT, I'm sorry.
3	A. I think that's a fair characterization,
4	yes.
5	Q. And this model, N-C-A-T all caps, does
6	not provide any information specific to traffic at a
7	given point in time within a day, right?
8	A. I don't believe so.
9	Q. It doesn't?
10	A. Not to my knowledge.
11	Q. I can't tell if you disagree with me or
12	agree with me.
13	MR. HARVEY: The witnesses are well brought
14	up, Carrie.
15	MS. HIGHTMAN: I don't know if that's a good
16	thing or a bad thing to not be clear.
17	Q. The model does not measure the
18	impact of traffic occurring during the busy hour of a
19	particular day either, does it?
20	A. Not in the NCAT, no.
21	Q. And neither does the NCAT model show how
22	the costs vary as the busy hour varies, right?

1	A. I don't believe so, no.
2	Q. You would agree with me, would you not,
3	that certain types of traffic occur during certain
4	times of day?
5	A. Generally, yes.
6	Q. Are you familiar with the extent to
7	which ISP traffic has shifted the busy hour?
8	A. I'm not aware to the extent, no.
9	Q. At page 12 of your testimony you talk
10	about the loops, long loops. Actually, I think you
11	do it throughout your testimony. But that's one
12	place where it occurs.
13	A. Okay.
14	Q. And I want to ask you some questions
15	about your terminology.
16	A. Okay.
17	Q. Isn't the term "loop" defined in the
18	First Report and Order, by rule of the FCC?
19	A. Could you point me to a specific
20	Q. Well, are you generally you use this
21	term

I believe it is, yes.

A.

1	Q. And would it be correct to state and
2	if you don't know the answer to this, would you tell
3	me that generally a loop extends from the main
4	distribution frame to the network interface device at
5	the customer's premises?
6	A. I think that's a fair characterization
7	of a loop for voice traffic, yes.
8	Q. Now, are you familiar with Paragraph
9	1090 of the First Report and Order?
10	A. I have read it.
11	Q. And can you isn't it correct that
12	Paragraph 1090 is the paragraph in which the FCC
13	discusses how a competitive carrier can establish its
14	entitlement to the tandem rate for transport and
15	terminating a local call generally?
16	A. Yes.
17	Q. Now, nowhere in Paragraph 1090 of the
18	First Report and Order did the FCC use the term loop
19	when it discussed a CLEC's entitlement to the tandem
20	rate for reciprocal compensation, isn't that correct?
21	And I can show you a copy oh, you have got it
22	there?

1	A. I have it here. I don't see the word
2	"loop."
3	Q. Wouldn't you agree that a fiber ring is
4	unlikely to extend from a main distribution frame to
5	a customer's premises?
6	MR. HARVEY: I will have to object to that.
7	I don't know whether he he certainly hasn't
8	expressed a whole lot of background here as an
9	engineer. It's not clear to me that he would know
L 0	necessarily what a specific, or generally, how that
L1	technology would work. And I don't think there is a
L 2	foundation for it.
L 3	EXAMINER WOODS: If that's the case, that's
L 4	the way he should answer.
L 5	MS. HIGHTMAN: And I would be interested to
L 6	know that.
L 7	Q. Do you remember the question?
L 8	A. Yes, and I am not aware of how a fiber
L 9	ring is connected to distribution.
20	Q. But you would agree, wouldn't you, that
21	in the FCC's Paragraph 1090 it makes reference to
22	fiber rings as one of the technologies that can
İ	

perform functions similar to the functions performed by an ILEC's tandem switch?

MR. HARVEY: Again, I object. That particular regulatory paragraph says what it says. He can agree that it does or it doesn't but it's not probative of anything.

MR. FRIEDMAN: If I may, I would like -- well, go ahead and answer his objection.

MS. HIGHTMAN: I would rather address them all at a time.

MR. FRIEDMAN: My objection is as follows and that is that the question is irrelevant for the following reasons: Although it was once in dispute, this is no longer in dispute. Paragraph 1090 of the First Report and Order bears on the subject -- it is discussion underlying the rule, and the Rule 51.711, implementing Section 251(b)5 of the 1996 Act concerning reciprocal compensation. If the FCC has made anything loud and clear, it is that that section of the statute and the rules under it, the FCC said in it declaratory ruling, are rules in Part H and that includes 51.711 and the underlying discussion

including Paragraph 1090, do not apply to internet traffic. So it really makes no difference for purposes of Issue 2 what Rule 1090 says. It is certainly pertinent to Issue 1. And so the objection is it really is irrelevant.

MS. HIGHTMAN: Then I think we need to be striking major portions of Mr. Phipps' testimony. He cites Paragraph 1090 in his testimony. He refers to Paragraph 1090. Putting aside that I actually believe it's extremely relevant to this case and to Focal's position in this case. If in fact Mr. Friedman is right, then I think we should just start cutting out major portions of Mr. Friedman's testimony right now.

MR. HARVEY: My only objection is that what he has to say about what the rule says is not --

MS. HIGHTMAN: He quotes the paragraph. I am asking him about the paragraph. I am entitled to do that.

EXAMINER WOODS: And I am troubled, as I always am, when attorneys ask witnesses what something says. Now, it says what it says. If you want to ask him if what it says impacts his opinion,

I think that's fine. But I am always troubled when people just ask people to read something into the record or to parrot back what a statute or rule says. It obviously does say that. He would be hard pressed to disagree with you that it says that. But just asking him whether it says that, I would agree with Mr. Harvey, does nothing to advance the issue.

If you want to ask him what the impact of that is, you can point him to that, ask him to agree with you that it says that, and then ask him a question as to whether or not that impacts his opinion. But I am always troubled by just asking a witness whether words appear on a written page. I just don't think it advances the subject.

MS. HIGHTMAN: Well, considering it's his written page, I think that's why I am asking it. I mean, I will hold on. It's not worth debating this issue. We've definitely debated it enough over the past few days. And I also don't think this rule has been applied evenly throughout but that's neither here nor there.

In any event, let me have the last

question back so I can figure out what my last train 1 2 of thought is. 3 (Whereupon the requested portion was then read back by 5 the Reporter.) MS. HIGHTMAN: 6 Would it be correct to summarize your 7 0. position in this case on the issue of the appropriate 8 9 rate to be paid for intercarrier compensation for 10 calls terminated to internet to be that you believe all facilities extending from Focal's switch to its 11 12 customers are loops which may or may not be long 13 loops as you use the phrase long loops? 14 Could you say from where to where again? Α. 15 From Focal's switch to its customers. 0. 16 I believe that that's more akin to what Α. 17 would be characterized as a local loop as opposed to 18 transport. I guess first I am asking you is that 19 Q. 20 your position that you believe that the facility 21 extending from Focal's switch to its customers are 22 loops, is that your position in this case?

1	A. Well, and when you say loops and you use
2	it in the FCC's definition as applied to voice
3	traffic, you are saying from the main distribution
4	frame to the network interface device. And in this
5	instance it is a little bit different because you are
6	talking about ISP traffic. And I believe that the
7	facility used to connect Focal's end users with the
8	switch would be more akin to the local loop.
9	Q. Okay. Have you reviewed Mr. Starkey's
L 0	supplemental verified statement in this case and in
L 1	particular page 14 where he provides a diagram?
L 2	A. Fourteen?
L 3	Q. Yeah.
L 4	A. Yes, I have. I have reviewed this.
L 5	Q. There is a diagram but there is also a
L 6	textual discussion, I believe, before and after the
L 7	diagram. Have you reviewed the text, too?
L 8	A. I have read it, yes.
L 9	Q. Are you aware of the fact that
20	Mr. Starkey has indicated that at portion of Focal's
21	facilities are transport facilities, not loop
22	facilities as the ECC defines that term?

1 MR. HARVEY: I will have to ask for some 2 clarification here. If she is asking whether he's 3 aware of what Mr. Starkey said, I quess he can answer that. 5 MS. HIGHTMAN: That's what I asked. 6 MR. HARVEY: Okay. Fair enough. Could you point me to exactly 7 THE WITNESS: 8 where Mr. Starkey says that? 9 MS. HIGHTMAN: 10 Well, I think you can look at the ' 0. 11 picture, the diagram on page 14. We can go to the 12 text, too, but the diagram says it as well. 13 I believe what Mr. Starkey is saying and A. 14 my understanding of his statement is that, for 15 example, in the situation of a collocated ISP, that 16 they use OC-48 which is generally identified as 17 transport facilities to route that traffic to their 18 collocated ISPs. I quess you could -- since he 19 believes that that's transport facilities, they 20 are -- they should recover the transport rate for 21 those facilities. Whereas if it's compared to a

traditional local loop for voice calls, that type of

1	transport would be recovered through the local loop
2	from the end user.
3	Q. But the transport facilities that you
4	were just describing with regard to a collocated
5	Focal ISP are not cost recovered from the ISP local
6	rates, right?
7	A. Through Ameritech's local rates is what
8	you are saying?
9	Q. No, no, through Focal's local rates,
10	right?
11	A. I don't know about that. I don't know
12	what Focal recovers through their local rates.
13	Q. Were you assuming when you prepared your
14	testimony that the transport facilities associated
15	with service to a collocated Focal ISP are recovered
16	by Focal through rates it charges the ISP?
17	A. Well, I wasn't assuming that. What I
18	was saying is, just because something is labeled as
19	transport facility, doesn't mean it's automatically
20	entitled to recover transport costs for the traffic
21	that goes over those facilities.
22	Q. Right. But you haven't answered my

1 question. 2 Α. No, I wasn't assuming that. 3 0. So you don't know whether Focal recovers 4 those costs from the internet service provider, those 5 costs being the costs of the transport we just 6 described? 7 Α. I am not aware of that but I would 8 believe that would be a portion that could be 9 justified to completely recovered from the ISP. 10 Have you reviewed Focal's testimony in 11 this case other than Mr. Starkey's? 12 Α. I concentrate on Issue 2. 13 Well, with regard to this issue has 0. 14 Focal indicated to your knowledge that the costs that 15 it believes should be recovered through intercarrier 16 compensation are now being recovered through rates it 17 charges its internet service providers directly? I'm not aware of what costs they recover 18 Α. 19 from their ISPs, specific to what you are talking 20 about, no. 21 Now, isn't it correct that a majority of 22 Focal's transport is provided on fiber optic

1	facilities?
2	A. I believe so.
3	Q. In fact, if we look at the we are
4	back on Mr. Starkey's page 14 of his supplemental
5	verified statement, the diagram, what is identified
6	on this diagram as Focal transport by dotted lines?
7	A. Yes.
8	Q. Isn't it your understanding that those
9	transport facilities are fiber optic facilities?
10	A. According to Mr. Starkey's diagram that
11	appears to be so.
12	Q. Well, do you have any reason to dispute
13	it?
14	A. I have no reason to dispute the diagram.
15	Q. And in fact, isn't it true or do you
16	know, whether Focal obtains these transport
17	facilities from carriers such as TCG?
18	A. According to the diagram it says that
19	it's Focal leased. I'm not sure where they get them
20	from.
21	Q. Would you agree with me that if there
22	are fiber optic transport facilities that extend from

1 Focal's rate, that Focal would qualify for the tandem 2 rate under the FCC's discussion in Paragraph 1090 of 3 the First Report and Order? 4 MR. HARVEY: I will have to object. 5 optic transport facilities extending from Focal's 6 switch to where? 7 MS. HIGHTMAN: If the facilities shown on Mr. Starkey's 8 0. 9 diagram that we have been looking at -- and you have 10 got it there? 11 Α. Yes. 12 If all the transport facilities which Q. 13 are the dotted lines that are shown on here that stem 14 from Focal's switch and go to Ameritech's central 15 offices or to the SONET node, if those are in fact 16 all fiber optic transport facilities, would you agree 17 that Foçal would qualify for the tandem rate 18 according to the language of Paragraph 1090 of the 19 FCC'S First Report and Order? 20 MR. FRIEDMAN: Objection, ambiguity for the 21 It's clear from the testimony of following reason. 22 the last few minutes that the word "transport" as the

1 witness understands it can be used in two ways, one 2 being the way the FCC uses it to talk about a piece of evidence which can be recovered through reciprocal 4 compensation and one the method the witnesses talk 5 about labeled transport which may or may not fall into that category. I think you need to be clear in 6 7 which of those two different meanings you use the 8 word "transport." 9 MS. HIGHTMAN: I think the witness can 10 answer the question. I don't need to be rephrasing 11 the question just to satisfy Ameritech's attorney. 12 His attorney hasn't objected. 13 I think you do in this MR. FRIEDMAN: 14 instance because the record is so clear that the word 15 can be used with these two different meanings that, 16 if you are not clear, I have no guarantee that the witness is understanding the same way you mean it 17 18 when he answers. 19 If he doesn't understand it, MS. HIGHTMAN: 20 he can explain it in his answer. 21 EXAMINER WOODS: I don't think the problem 22 is that -- I don't think we will know what he

1	understands by looking at his answer. I think he can
2	understand perfectly but we don't know how he is
3	using the terms.
4	MS. HIGHTMAN: Well, maybe I will ask him to
5	explain it when he gives the answer.
6	Q. Why don't you do that? When you
7	answer the question, explain what you mean by
8	transport.
9	A. Well, I think the question was in a
10	sense do all the dotted lines qualify, I'm sorry, the
11	dotted lines on Mr. Starkey's diagram which he
12	represents as Focal transport, does that qualify
13	Focal to receive the tandem rate? Is that the
14	question?
15	Q. Yes.
16	EXAMINER WOODS: If it's all fiber optic.
17	MS. HIGHTMAN: Oh, thank you.
18	THE WITNESS: A. No, I would not agree with
19	that.
20	MS. HIGHTMAN:
21	Q. And the reason being?
22	A. I just first of all, I don't think

1	that all the dotted lines on the diagram represent
2	transport in the FCC's definition. And that's where
3	my disagreement lies. I don't believe that in my
4	opinion that that would be indicative of what the FCC
5	was alluding to.
6	Q. Now, if we look at the diagram again.
7	A. Yes.
8	Q. These facilities, the transport
9	facilities, that are shown as the dotted lines
10	A. Yes.
11	Q Do not terminate at the customer
12	premises, do they?
13	A. What customer premises are you talking
14	about?
15	Q. Any of them. They terminate at either
16	Ameritech's central offices or at Focal's SONET node,
17	right, as they come from the Focal switch?
18	A. Except for the dotted line that ends at
19	the Focal ISP and the collocated switch, I'm sorry,
20	for the collocated ISPs.
21	
2, 1	Q. Putting that aside.

1	Q. Yes. Would you agree?
2	A. If we remove that one, I would agree
3	that the dotted lines in the diagram either end at
4	the Ameritech CO or Ameritech end offices or the
5	SONET node.
6	Q. So they wouldn't technically be loops as
7	the FCC has defined that term, isn't that right,
8	because they don't end at a network interface device
9	at a customer's premises?
10	A. Well, I think I would
11	Q. Can you answer that questions?
12	A. I'm sorry, could you repeat the
13	question?
14	Q. So those transport facilities that we
15	have been talking about other than the one to the
16	collocated ISP are not loops as the FCC has defined
17	that term because they do not terminate at a NID in a
18	customers premises, right?
19	A. Well, I would agree with you as far as
20	the dotted lines that are connected with Ameritech's
21	end offices.
22	Q. Are you aware of the fact that where the

1 transport facility begins at the Ameritech CO on 2 this, and there is several of them, several transport 3 facilities are shown on here, where they start, one 4 of them is at the end of the Ameritech CO, do you see 5 where I am at? 6 Yes, generally. Α. 7 Is it your understanding that that's 8 where Ameritech hands-off its traffic, the traffic to 9 Focal? 10 Α. I believe in certain instances that they 11 do. 12 Isn't that true with regard to all these 0. 1.3 COs that are shown on the diagram? 14 Well, all of these COs on the diagram, 15 yes. And wouldn't you also agree that these 16 0. 17 facilities, the transport facilities on this diagram, 18 begin and end at, except for the one for the Focal 19 collocated ISP -- we will put that aside for this 20 question -- begin and end at the Ameritech CO and the 21 Focal switch respectively? 22 With the exception of the SONET node. Α.

1	Q. Okay. And would you agree that the
2	function of these facilities, the dotted line
3	facilities, is to aggregate traffic brought in from
4	the Ameritech central office to the Focal switch?
5	A. I don't believe that it's necessarily to
6	aggregate the traffic. I think it transports the
7	traffic.
8	Q. It brings the traffic from the CO to the
9	Focal switch, right?
10	A. It transports the traffic from
11	Ameritech's CO to the Focal switch.
12	Q. Would you agree with me that the FCC has
13	recognized in Paragraph 1090 that there is a trade
14	off between a hierarchical switching network and
15	transport?
16	MR. HARVEY: I guess I will have to renew my
17	objection. What the Paragraph 1090 says what it
18	says.
19	MS. HIGHTMAN: I am not asking if it says
20	those words. I am asking what the gist of it is
21	because he is interpreting this to come up with his
22	position.

1	EXAMINER WOODS: That's what I understood
2	the question to be.
3	MR. HARVEY: Fair enough.
4	MS. HIGHTMAN: Could you read it back,
5	please?
6	(Whereupon the requested
7	portion was then read back by
8	the Reporter.)
9	THE WITNESS: A. Well, I personally don't
10	see anything about a hierarchical switch structure
11	mentioned in there, but my understanding of 1090 says
12	that, to the extent that a CLEC would use new
13	technologies where they serve a geographical area
14	compared to the one served by the ILEC, that they
15	could possibly qualify for the tandem rate.
16	MS. HIGHTMAN:
17	Q. Would you agree that Mr. Starkey's
18	diagram indicates that Focal has leased extensive
19	fiber optic facilities?
20	MR. FRIEDMAN: Objection. The diagram shows
21	what it shows and Mr. Starkey says what he says, and
22	it makes little difference what this witness might

1 have to say about what it seems to depict. 2 He is reaching a conclusion MS. HIGHTMAN: regarding what the FCC's language requires. 3 4 interpreting the FCC's rules. 5 EXAMINER WOODS: Right. I join in the objection. 6 MR. HARVEY: She 7 is just asking him to interpret the diagram, or not even interpret, recite what the diagram --8 9 MS. HIGHTMAN: No, he's not. 10 EXAMINER WOODS: Okay, Ms. Hightman, my only 11 question is what is the relevance of whether or not 12 Focal has an extensive fiber optic system in place if 13 that is his testimony? 14 MS. HIGHTMAN: Because he is saying we do 15 not qualify under 1090 for the tandem rate. 1090 says is that states shall consider whether new 16 17 technologies, for example, specifically fiber rings 18 or wireless networks, which is not relevant here, 19 perform functions similar to those performed by the 20 ILEC's tandem switch. What difference does it 21 EXAMINER WOODS: 22 make whether Focal has one foot of fiber optics in

1 the ground or one hundred miles as far as the 2 application of 1090. It seems to me if they are 3 utilizing the technology, then an argument can be 4 made that they should qualify. But I am at a loss to 5 understand why how much they have is an issue. Well, I don't know if I 6 MS. HIGHTMAN: 7 disagree with you on that. But I'm not sure he 8 agrees with us on that and that's why I am probing 9 his --10 EXAMINER WOODS: That doesn't solve my 11 question about relevance. What difference does it 12 make -- if you can explain to me what difference it 13 makes how much fiber there is, then I can at least 14 consider allowing this line of questioning. 15 difference does it make? 16 MS. HIGHTMAN: I don't think it makes a 17 difference but I think Staff thinks it makes a difference. 18 19 EXAMINER WOODS: Why don't you ask him that, 20 whether or not he thinks there is a lot in the 21 ground, would it make a difference to him if they had 22 a lot or a little?

1	MS. HIGHTMAN:
2	Q. Can you answer that question?
3	A. Well, I think admittedly that would be
4	my opinion but
5	Q. What would be your opinion?
6	A. Whether a little or a lot matters.
7	EXAMINER SHOWTIS: Does it?
8	MS. HIGHTMAN:
9	Q. You are saying it matters if there is
10	more?
11	A. Well, for example, Mr. Starkey described
12	an intra-office fiber ring, and I don't believe in my
13	opinion that that would be what the FCC was referring
14	to when it was describing these new technologies.
15	Q. But does the amount of fiber that's part
16	of the Focal network in your mind play into the
17	decision as to whether they qualify for the tandem
18	rate?
19	A. I think it depends on what the fiber is
20	used for.
21	Q. And in fact isn't what Mr what we
22	have been discussing for the most part as far as the

1 dotted lines on Mr. Starkey's diagram are the 2 interoffice facilities, not the intra-office 3 facilities that you just mentioned? 4 Α. That's true. 5 0. Referring to your Attachment 1? 6 Α. Yes. 0. I want to look at what you have got on 8 your Attachment 1 and in a sense compare it with what 9 Mr. Starkey shows on his diagram that we have been 10 looking at. Looking at what you identify as Facility 11 A on your Attachment 1? 12 Α. Yes. 13 Isn't it true that, according to Focal's 14 description of its network as presented in this case, 15 that what you show as Facility A might very well 16 travel to an Ameritech central office or the 17 equivalent, and is actually -- well, first let me ask 18 that. Is that true? 19 Α. I guess that's possible. 20 And, in fact, if it does, it is actually 21 comprised of two different facilities, a transport 22 facility and a local distribution channel?

1 Assuming that that would be equivalent 2 to the Ameritech CO, I think that's right. And isn't that what's depicted, if you 3 Ο. can answer this question, look back to Mr. Starkey's 4 5 diagram, as the Focal customer, ISP customers, served from Ameritech's Central Office E on the right side 6 of the diagram? 7 MR. HARVEY: I will have to object to that. 8 9 I don't think that Mr. Phipps can tell us what 10 Mr. Starkey was thinking when he prepared this 11 diagram. The question is I am trying 12 MS. HIGHTMAN: 13 to understand what he understands Focal's network to be made of or to be comprised of. And he has talked 14 15 about loops versus transport. We have gone through 16 extensive questioning on that. That's a significant 17 issue in the determination of the rate for 18 intercarrier compensation. If he doesn't know, he 19 doesn't know. But I am entitled to ask him about it, 20 whether he has reviewed this and what his 21 understanding is. 22 MR. HARVEY: Well, to that extent it's